

Lisa Toof

From: Roelof Van Ark
Sent: Wednesday, October 27, 2010 5:02 PM
To: Carrie Pourvahidi
Subject: FW: Private - HSR starter segment selection criteria comments

From: diridon, rod [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, October 22, 2010 1:18 PM
To: Roelof Van Ark
Subject: Private - HSR starter segment selection criteria comments

Roelof,

My responses to the subject selection criteria sent in your following e-mail, follow:

- 1) A general note might be included indicting that the criteria for the first corridor may not be the criteria for selecting the follow-on segments.
- 2) Should not a criteria be included under #I indicating additional priority for a starter segment that has connectivity to multiple future segments?
- 3) Since both relate to risks, you may want to consolidate # II and #III to avoid appearing to overact to that one issue.
- 4) The mention of potential litigation (III , third item) as a major deterrent seems simplistic. Are we not truly concerned about litigation that can not be defended rather than the just the threat of litigation which may be spurious and might even have already been successfully defended? The simple threat of litigation might be used purely as a delaying tactic if given priority even though the AGs office is fully capable of successfully defending against the threatened litigation if actually pursued.
- 5) The last word in #IV, item 2, might be changed from "transport" to "public transit" to reinforce the need to use transit to access the HSR stations and not just more parking lots and cars.
- 6) On page 1 of Appendix D there seems to be an incompatibility. The "Top speed Item" indicates 220 MPH for the two Valley segments yet item two above "Initial work includes electrification" shows the two Valley segments as not being initially electrified. Either they are electrified or we can't make 220...can that be rationalized?
- 7) On that same page, why is the Merced to Fresno segment identified as having two stations when the Fresno to Bakersfield segment shows only Fresno and not Bakersfield as stations?

That's the best I can do right now but may have other comments before the 10/27 response deadline. Please keep me informed. Enjoy the weekend.

Rod

Rod Diridon, Sr., Executive Director
Mineta Transportation Institute (MTI)

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Roelof Van Ark [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, October 14, 2010 10:32 PM
To: .Distribution [REDACTED] board
Cc: Lisa Toof; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
Jeffrey M. Barker
Subject: October 20 Board Meeting

Dear Board Members,

We have some important schedule and procedural changes, as follows:

- For various reasons, including the fact that the FRA has still not announced its FY10 funding allocations, the Board Meeting scheduled for the 20th October 2010 is cancelled.
- The Finance Committee meeting (mainly to confirm the Financial advisors) will still take place in Sacramento on Oct 20th between 10AM and 11 AM
- The "Selection Criteria" for the selection of the first section to be constructed will be published on the internet and made public by the weekend.
- You have received a new "Staff Memorandum" attached to this mail. It differs from the one sent with your original Board Book. Please read it carefully, as it contains important information on the process which now needs to be followed for you to comment to the "Selection Criteria". Please follow this process carefully.

Regards,

Roelof

Roelof van Ark
Chief Executive Officer
California High-Speed Rail Authority
[REDACTED]

Lisa Toof

From: Roelof Van Ark
Sent: Wednesday, October 27, 2010 5:04 PM
To: Carrie Pourvahidi
Subject: FW: Staff Memorandum - "Selection Criteria"

From: McDermott, Sandra [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, October 25, 2010 11:29 AM
To: Roelof Van Ark
Subject: RE: Staff Memorandum - "Selection Criteria"

This message is sent by Sandra McDermott on behalf of Russ Burns.

Dear Mr. van Ark,

Pursuant to your communication of October 14, 2010, I have reviewed the "Selection Criteria" contained in the October 15, 2010 memorandum (Agenda item #2) and its appendices. Specifically, I have carefully reviewed Appendix A, the Selection Criteria outlined therein – including statutory provisions of the ARRA and Proposition 1A, selection priorities, and preconditions for seeking/using bond proceeds - and the corresponding comments.

I am in agreement with all the comments contained in Section B of Appendix A and with the program defined selection criteria as outlined in Section C also of Appendix A. I have no further suggestions at this time.

Regards,
Russ Burns

From: Roelof Van Ark [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, October 14, 2010 10:32 PM
To: .Distribution [REDACTED] board
Cc: Lisa Toof; [REDACTED];
Jeffrey M. Barker
Subject: October 20 Board Meeting

Dear Board Members,

We have some important schedule and procedural changes, as follows:

- For various reasons, including the fact that the FRA has still not announced its FY10 funding allocations, the Board Meeting scheduled for the 20th October 2010 is cancelled.
- The Finance Committee meeting (mainly to confirm the Financial advisors) will still take place in Sacramento on Oct 20th between 10AM and 11 AM
- The "Selection Criteria" for the selection of the first section to be constructed will be published on the internet and made public by the weekend.

- You have received a new "Staff Memorandum" attached to this mail. It differs from the one sent with your original Board Book. Please read it carefully, as it contains important information on the process which now needs to be followed for you to comment to the "Selection Criteria". Please follow this process carefully.

Regards,

Roelof

Roelof van Ark
Chief Executive Officer
California High-Speed Rail Authority

